

represents the first legal regime specifically aimed towards the prevention of NIS introductions through the hull fouling vector in the marine environment (Australian Quarantine and Inspection Service, 2005). The rule will become mandatory in October of 2006 after a one year voluntary period, and requires that vessel gear and seawater systems are clean of marine pests and growths. In addition, operators must perform one of three antifouling measures:

- Clean the hull one month prior to arrival
- Apply antifouling paint within one year before arrival
- Book the vessel to be slipped and cleaned within one week of arrival

### ***The Australian and New Zealand Environment Conservation Council (ANZECC)***

The Australian and New Zealand Environment Conservation Council (ANZECC) was a Ministerial Council that operated from 1991 to 2001 to develop coordinated policies between member nations. The Council produced codes of practice to minimize pollution problems caused by toxic antifouling paints and to reduce the release of fouling NIS. In-water cleaning is prohibited, except in extraordinary circumstances. The codes do allow the cleaning of sea chests, grids, and hull apertures under permit if debris was not allowed into the water or onto the seafloor, and also allow propeller polishing under permit (ANZECC, 1997).

### ***Merchant Classification Society Requirements***

As discussed earlier, classification societies require periodic hull inspections and dry docking of commercial vessels (See Section IV, "Merchant Fleet Efforts to Keep Vessels Clean"). Though requirements vary slightly depending on the age of a vessel and classification, they generally require vessels to be dry docked at least once every five years. However, none of the societies requires the hull to be cleaned while dry docked. Nevertheless, because of the increased fuel consumption that can result from fouling, and because the dry docking process is costly and difficult to schedule, most companies take the opportunity to clean and paint vessel hulls during these periods.

Most companies also conduct interim in-water cleanings according to fuel performance tests, in order to maintain cost effective fuel efficiency.

Due to the lack of scientific knowledge on the most effective and practicable options for the prevention of NIS from commercial vessel fouling, no national policies have been adopted. For similar reasons, strategies that have been implemented in select regions range widely (See Table VI.1.). Clearly, more research will be needed to evaluate where the highest risks of NIS introduction lie and which preventative actions might be most protective.

Country/State/ Port	Management Strategy	Details
U.S. Federal	Embedded in ballast water regulation	Rinse anchor chains and anchors at place of origin
California	Embedded in ballast water statute	Remove fouling from hull, piping and tanks on a regular basis. Dispose wastes in accordance with local, state, and federal law.
Hawaii	Information Framework Targeting High Risk Vessels (Proposed)	Pro-active measures: Education/outreach, vessel arrival monitoring, evaluation for high-risk arrivals (See Figure VI.1.) Re-active measures: Rapid response/investigation of high risk event Post-event measures: Long term regulations for high-risk events <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limit time in port</li> <li>• Vessel quarantine</li> <li>• Out of water cleaning</li> </ul>
New Zealand	Survey  (On Ballast Water Declaration Form)	1. When and where was the vessel last dry-docked and cleaned? 2. Has the vessel been laid-up for 3 months or more since it was last dry-docked and cleaned? If YES, state when and where. (Also requests start and end date laid up) 3. Do you intend to clean the hull of the vessel in New Zealand? If YES, state when and where
	Voluntary Codes of Practice  (Fishing Industry)	Chartered foreign owned or sourced fishing vessels must be substantially free from plant or animal growth prior to entering New Zealand's EEZ.  If no assurance, vessel inspected and cleaned before departure.  Otherwise inspected in NZ and if necessary, fouling removed so no foreign organisms enter the marine environment

**Table VI.1: Summary of Current Management Frameworks for Vessel Fouling.** Various regulations, proposed management actions, recommendations, guidelines, and codes of practice aimed towards preventing NIS introductions through fouling are summarized below.

Country/State/ Port	Management Strategy	Details
Australia	Prohibition (States/Territories/ Ports)	States& territories prohibit in-water cleaning. Many require containment and disposal regulations of fouling debris removed during out-of-water cleaning.
	Regulation (Vessels less than 25 m)	Keep ancillary gear and internal seawater systems clean of marine pests and growths, and Before departing your last port for Australia... <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Clean hull within one month before arrival OR</li> <li>○ Apply antifouling paint within one year before arrival OR</li> <li>○ Book vessel for slipping and cleaning within one week of arrival (cleaning should be in a shipway where material removed can be collected and disposed of away from the sea)</li> </ul>
Australia and New Zealand Environmental Conservation Council (ANZECC)	Codes of Practice	In-water hull cleaning prohibited, except under extraordinary circumstances. Sea-chests, sea suction grids, other hull apertures may be allowed under permit, if debris not allowed to pass to water column or sea bed. Polishing propellers may be allowed under permit.
Merchant Classification Societies	Requirements  (Applies to majority of merchant fleet)	Dry dock requirements vary somewhat depending on classification society. Generally: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Dry dock every 5 years. Cleaning and painting is usually conducted, but is at the discretion of the company.</li> <li>○ Interim in-water cleanings: Periodicity at the discretion of the company. Typically dependent on results of fuel consumption tests.</li> </ul>

Table VI.1 (Continued): Summary of Current Management Frameworks for Vessel Fouling

## **VII. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

The most difficult challenge to developing recommendations that reduce the introduction of NIS from fouling is the limited amount of direct research that has been conducted on the vector. While studies in a number of regions indicate that fouling is an important mechanism through which modern invasions occur, few modern baseline studies have been conducted to characterize the vector, particularly in North America. Although generalizations can be made on factors that influence the degree of vessel fouling based on studies in regions outside of the mainland U.S., the information is not adequate to evaluate the specific NIS potential of the majority of vessels calling to California. While vessels with extreme characteristics that exacerbate fouling likely pose a risk, there is little information on the potential risk posed by the majority of the fleet that conducts regular vessel maintenance and exhibits more common behaviors.

The Commission believes, however, that these difficulties should not prevent the State from moving forward with actions at this time. Staff approached the development of recommendations by considering which actions can be implemented now to reduce NIS introduction via fouling based on the knowledge currently available, and what actions are needed to build information and the tools needed to refine management measures in the future.

### **Legislation should be adopted to:**

#### **1. Broaden the State Program to include the control and prevention of NIS release via commercial vessel fouling.**

The Act currently focuses on the prevention of NIS introduction through ballast water discharges, and does not authorize the Commission to adopt regulations to prevent NIS introduction through vessel fouling. This lack of explicit authority prevents the Commission from implementing regulatory actions related to the vessel fouling vector.

**2. Broaden the reporting requirements to include mandatory reporting on maintenance practices and other fouling-related behaviors of qualifying vessels operating in California waters.**

Both vessel movement patterns and maintenance practices are factors that strongly influence the degree of fouling found on vessels. Long mooring periods, slow transit speeds, and infrequent use of antifouling paint and systems have been found to facilitate fouling accumulation. However, there is currently no information on which characteristics are representative of the vessels that arrive to and/or operate in California, and how many of these vessels exhibit potentially higher risk characteristics.

It is known that the vast majority of vessel operators clean and paint hulls every five years, and perform periodic in-water cleaning during the interim. Most strive to minimize fouling due to operational dangers and increased fuel costs. Most also aim to maximize transit speeds and minimize time in port. However, case studies outside of California have observed that a small minority of vessels do not follow these maintenance schedules and/or do not exhibit these transit behaviors, and some have been found with excessive fouling. For example, a decommissioned military vessel that had been moored in Washington State for 5 years was observed to have accumulated over 112 species prior to its relocation to Hawaii (Brock et al. 1999). With such contrasting profiles, it will be critical to characterize vessels in California waters to better evaluate the nature of the risk posed by commercial vessels. Coupled with biological surveys of NIS fouling on vessels that operate in the State, vessel maintenance and behavior information will provide a better understanding of the actual NIS risk posed by fouling, and will be key for identifying appropriate management solutions that minimize the risk of NIS introductions via this pathway. The adoption of this recommendation would lead to an increase in the cost of the Commission Program associated with increased staff requirements for data entry, compilation, and analysis; as well as additional vessel inspections and monitoring.

**3. Expand enforcement components of the Act to address mandatory reporting in Recommendation 2.**

The California Marine Invasive Species program is supported by active reporting compliance monitoring, outreach to the shipping community, and the authority to apply penalties for non-compliance, which has yielded reporting rates that have exceeded 90% since 2000 (Falkner, 2003; Falkner, et al. 2005). In contrast, mandatory reporting for the federal ballast water program is not similarly reinforced, and reporting rates were approximately 30% during 1999-2001 (Ruiz et al., 2001), making a sound assessment of the data impossible. The Commission therefore believes that the authority to apply penalties for non-reporting coupled with outreach to and monitoring of the shipping community, will ensure higher reporting rates. This authority will help assure that information collected through the survey provides representative information on the vessels operating in California ports or places. The adoption of this recommendation is not expected to increase the cost of the Commission Program above those anticipated with the adoption of Recommendation 2.

**4. Authorize the Commission to develop and adopt regulations that prevents or minimizes the introduction of NIS via vessel fouling.**

Regulations to define regular vessel maintenance practices for the control of NIS fouling on commercial vessels are needed. These should place requirements or restrictions on vessels that do not adhere to the defined practices. Though there is a limited amount of scientific knowledge on the quantity and NIS risk presented by fouling that may be present on well maintained vessels operating in California, case studies show that a minority of vessels do not follow minimal "good housekeeping" practices. For example, a barge that had not been dry docked for at least 10 years was found in New Zealand with over 28 tons of fouling (Coutts, 2005(b)). Such vessels have been found with extensive amounts of fouling and present high risk scenarios for NIS introduction (See Section V, "Review of Current Knowledge on Vessel Fouling and NIS" for further discussion).

Both the Act and the federal ballast water regulation (33 CFR 151.2035(a)(6)) require that vessels remove fouling on a regular basis, however, no definition or criteria is provided for the term "regular". Given the high NIS risk posed by vessels that are not adequately maintained, the intent of the Act would be better served if criteria were placed on a definition for regular inspections and cleaning, and if vessels that do not adhere to defined criteria are subject to further examination.

The Commission should therefore be authorized to adopt regulations that define parameters for regular husbandry practices for fouling control, and should be authorized to place requirements on vessels that do not follow such practices. Vessels that are not regularly maintained should be compelled to notify the Commission prior to their entry into or movement within California waters. Such a framework would serve to flag potential high risk vessels, providing an opportunity for the Commission to gather information on the frequency of arrivals of potentially high-risk vessels to California ports, and to work with vessel operators on actions that can minimize the adverse impacts of a highly fouled vessel. Adoption of this recommendation is not expected to increase the cost of the Commission Program above those anticipated with the adoption of Recommendation 2.

**5. Expand and coordinate biological research directed towards characterizing the NIS risk posed by commercial vessel fouling with other federal and state agencies.**

The limited amount of scientific research on vessel fouling and NIS in California and the West Coast is the most prominent obstacle to a clear evaluation of the overall risk faced by the State. Existing studies have been conducted on limited numbers and types of vessels, in regions largely outside of North America. Though relative generalizations from these studies regarding factors that influence fouling likely apply to vessels operating in California waters, the magnitude of the NIS risk cannot be extrapolated to the State. For example, while it may be presumed that a vessel that travels at an average of 7 KTS likely has more fouling than one that travels at 17 KTS, it is not known



how much fouling, how many NIS, or the level of NIS risk that may be presented on each.

A number of questions critical for the development of effective, scientifically grounded management remain. At a minimum, information is needed to address the most basic, but most important question: How many fouling organisms and how many NIS arrive to and move within California via vessel fouling? Such information is critical for a characterization of the NIS risk faced by California. When coupled with vessel maintenance and movement patterns linked to fouling accumulation, research would lay the foundation to fill additional information gaps such as which kinds of vessels harbor notably more fouling than others, what criteria can be used to flag a potentially high risk vessel, and which vessels pose a negligible amount of risk. Answers to these kinds of management-based research questions can guide the formulation of preventative management actions in the future. Funds necessary to support such a research program could be obtained through three mechanisms: general funds, grants, or through the existing fees assessed on ships. The cost to adopt this recommendation to the Commission Program could be as much as \$500,000 annually.

#### **6. Support continued long-term NIS monitoring in California waters.**

Long-term biological monitoring is necessary to evaluate the effectiveness of management efforts to prevent NIS introductions; particularly as new management actions are implemented. Surveys are also crucial for determining how to modify or enhance management actions so they are optimally effective for reducing invasions. As mandated by the Act, the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) administers a statewide monitoring program for NIS within California's estuaries and along its coast. Legislation should support the CDFG's continued long-term survey efforts so data may be used to evaluate the effectiveness of management measures implemented to prevent NIS introductions via vessel fouling. Adoption of this recommendation is expected to increase the cost of the CDFG Program.

## **7. Support research promoting technology development.**

Vessel owners and operators strive to maintain clean hulls in order to minimize fuel costs, maximize vessel speed, meet classification society requirements, and to help ensure the structural integrity of their vessels. Available information indicates that hull cleaning at dry docks in California presents a lowered NIS risk because these facilities are required to prevent fouling debris from entering the water column. Complete cleaning and re-coating with antifouling paint may provide better long-term antifouling protection than does in-water cleaning. Dry dock facilities capable of accommodating commercial class vessels, however, are limited, expensive, and scheduled well in advance. Most owners and operators therefore conduct in-water cleaning between required dry dockings.

In-water cleaning is one of several ways through which fouling NIS can be transferred from a vessel to a recipient port, and the activity poses some NIS introduction risk. Because of the potential for in-water cleaning to release NIS and toxic antifouling paint debris, Australian territories and states have banned the practice. However, in the absence of in-water cleaning, fouling organisms are still capable of transfer through spawning or by detachment from a vessel, and it has been contended that spawning or brood release may be the most important release mechanism (Michin and Gollasch, 2003; Davidson et al, 2005). There has been no direct research to indicate if the fouling NIS risk is lower if in-water cleaning is banned or if it is allowed it to proceed. Clearly, NIS release can occur under either situation, and neither is optimal.

A technology that collects and contains in-water cleaning debris would be a desirable avenue to prevent NIS release during in-water cleaning, while also providing commercial operators an avenue to clean hulls without placing a vessel in dry dock. In addition, a containment-based in-water cleaning technology could provide a tool to handle cases where a heavily fouled, high NIS risk vessel arrives to the State, and dry docks are not available. Prototype technologies have been under development to contain both fouling debris and toxic antifouling paint residuals; however, none are currently available for commercial application.

Additionally, as a result of current and impending regional bans on toxic antifouling coatings, many commercial vessel paint manufacturers are developing non-toxic antifouling coatings. However, current commercially available products are only effective for a minority of vessels that travel at very high speeds. As more regions adopt bans on coatings that release biocides, it will be important that alternative antifouling tools are available to prevent the accumulation of fouling and minimize NIS introductions.

Legislation should therefore facilitate the advancement of in-water cleaning technologies that collect and contain fouling debris. The long-term goal of these technologies would be to phase out in-water cleaning activities in California that are not contained. Legislation should also facilitate the advancement of antifouling coatings that create little or no water quality impacts, and which are effective for preventing fouling accumulation on vessels. The advancement of both of these technologies would fulfill the intent of the Act to move the state towards the elimination of NIS discharge into waters of the State in a manner that also addresses water quality issues that may be generated by the antifouling practices of vessels. Funds necessary to support such a research program could be obtained through three mechanisms: general funds, grants, or through the existing fees assessed on ships. The cost to the Commission Program could be as much as \$500,000 annually.

**8. Direct the State and Regional Water Quality Control Boards, in cooperation with the U. S. Environmental Protection Agency, to evaluate the effects of biocidal antifouling coatings from vessels on water quality.**

Copper enters California's freshwater, estuarine, and marine environments from a variety of sources, including copper-based antifouling paints on vessels. Due to copper contamination, California's major ports are included on California's 2002 list of impaired waters as defined by the Clean Water Act Section 303(d).

Though outside of the intent and scope of the Act to "...move the state expeditiously towards the elimination of the discharge of nonindigenous species into the waters of the

state...,” the Commission feels that water quality impairments that may be caused by vessel antifouling practices warrant attention. The Commission recommends that the State and/or Regional Water Quality Control Board(s) investigate the issue in cooperation with the United States Environmental Protection Agency, under the authority and jurisdiction granted to them by the Clean Water Act. Full chemical constituent identification and toxicological literature reviews should be conducted to assess the potential aquatic toxicities of all antifouling paints now in use in California’s waters, including their propensity for bioaccumulation, leaching potential, and general environmental fate. More specifically, it should be determined if copper leachate from antifouling practices is contributing to:

- The impairments in the 2002 California list developed pursuant to the federal Clean Water Act Section 303(d).
- An exceedance of water quality criteria as provided under the California Toxics Rule (40 CFR Part 131) for inland surface waters, enclosed bays, and estuaries.
- An exceedance of criteria for priority pollutants as provided in the 2005 California Ocean Plan for near coastal ocean waters.

If it is determined that antifouling practices of vessels do contribute to water body impairment or exceedance of water quality criteria, the boards should adopt or amend water quality plans and or Total Maximum Daily Loads accordingly, as directed by the federal Clean Water Act. SWRCB Program costs may increase and the appropriate funding source needs to be identified.

**9. Expand the Marine Invasive Species Program’s existing outreach and education program to include the fouling vector.**

The goal of expanding the Program’s existing outreach and education program would be to inform ports, the merchant shipping industry, the military, resource agencies and policy makers about vessel fouling and its role as an NIS vector. Nonindigenous species transport and introduction through vessel fouling is a relatively new issue for many of these entities, and there is little to no awareness of its importance amongst

these groups. The problem was underscored during the TAG meetings by a coincidental controversy over the proposed establishment of a ship breaking operation in Oregon, and the associated transfer of vessels from the Suisun Bay Reserve Fleet to the proposed operation or to an established operation in Texas. Though vessels in the reserve fleet exhibit exaggerated, high risk characteristics for fouling accumulation, there had been no consideration for the potential for NIS transfer prior to the public opposition and media attention that emerged over the controversy.

Outreach to the stakeholder community should clearly be part of the early steps in any NIS prevention program. Such efforts allow affected parties to come up to speed on an issue, to become educated participants in the search for preventative strategies, and provide the opportunity to take voluntary action to prevent NIS introductions and spread. There was strong agreement amongst TAG members that outreach should be a high priority, particularly in light of the limited knowledge of fouling and NIS on the majority of the fleet that operates in California waters. Operations engaged in theoretically high fouling risk operations should be high priority targets of outreach. These would include (but are not limited to) the military, the Maritime Administration, salvage operators, companies operating oil platforms, and vessel towing companies. Awareness should also be raised amongst those involved with policy development, so well informed decisions can be made as emerging science provides a better understanding of the problem, and effective solutions for it. Adoption of this recommendation is not expected to increase the cost of the Commission Program.

**10. Direct appropriate agencies to address the risk of fouling related NIS introduction and spread in California waters by vessels under 300 gross registered tons.**

The Act explicitly directs the Commission to evaluate the risk of NIS introductions by vessels over 300 gross registered tones, able to carry ballast. However, it is important to recognize that any vessel or structure of any size, with or without ballast water tanks, may accumulate fouling and subsequently transport NIS. Factors that influence fouling

on commercial vessels described in this report also apply to other structures, including private boats or yachts, fishing vessels, and navigational buoys (Railkin, 2004).

Though vessels and structures under 300 gross registered tones are not encompassed by the Act, the Commission and the TAG believe that they are likely an important means for the introduction and spread of marine, estuarine and freshwater invasive species within California waters. The Commission recommends that the release and transfer of NIS through vessel types not included in the Act, including recreational and fishing vessels, be examined by the agency(ies) with the appropriate authority and jurisdiction. Recommendations for the reduction of NIS introductions from non-commercial shipping, non-ballast water vectors should be provided to the Legislature.

## VIII. LITERATURE CITED

- Apte, S., B.S. Holland, L.S. Godwin, J.P.A. Gardner. 2000. Jumping ship: A stepping stone event mediating transfer of a non-indigenous species via a potentially unsuitable environment. *Biological Invasions*. 2: 75-79.
- Australian and New Zealand Environment Conservation Council (ANZECC). 1997. Code of practice for antifouling and in-water hull cleaning and maintenance. 12 pgs.
- Australian Quarantine and Inspection Service. 2005. New biofouling laws to protect Australia.  
Accessed October 15, 2005.  
Website: <http://www.affa.gov.au/content/output.cfm?ObjectID=7FBA840F432449E3B22BCB2C4A3B28E8>.
- Brock, R., J.H. Bailey-Brock, J. Goody. 1999. A case study of efficacy of freshwater immersion in controlling introduction of alien marine fouling communities: The USS Missouri. *Pacific Science*. 53: 223-231.
- California Regional Water Quality Control Board San Francisco Bay Region. 1999. Waste discharge requirements for: San Francisco Drydock Inc. Order No. 99-035. NPDES Permit No. CA0005321. 15 pgs.
- California State Water Resources Control Board. 2005. California Ocean Plan. Water quality control plan, ocean waters of California. 57 pgs.
- Carlton, J.T. and J. Hodder. 1995. Biogeography and dispersal of coastal marine organisms: experimental studies on a replica of a 16<sup>th</sup>-century sailing vessel. *Marine Biology*. 121: 721-730.
- Carlton, J.T. 2001. Introduced Species in U.S. coastal waters: Environmental impacts and Management Priorities. Pew Oceans Commission. Arlington, VA. 28 pp.
- Coutts, A.D.M. 1999. Hull fouling as a modern vector for marine biological invasions: Investigation of merchant vessels visiting northern Tasmania. Thesis. Australian Maritime College. 283 pgs.
- Coutts, A.D.M., K.M. Moore, C.L. Hewitt. 2003. Ships' sea-chests: an overlooked transfer mechanism for non-indigenous marine species? *Marine Pollution Bulletin* 46: 1504-1515.
- Coutts, A.D.M. and M.D. Taylor. 2004. A preliminary investigation of biosecurity risks associated with biofouling on merchant vessels in New Zealand. *New Zealand Journal of Marine and Freshwater Research*. 38: 215-229.

- Coutts, A.D.M. 2005 (a). Managing marine biosecurity in New Zealand: From a research provider's perspective. *In* Hull fouling as a mechanism for marine invasive species introductions. *Proceedings of a workshop on current issues and potential management strategies*. February 12-13, 2004. pp. 36-46. Godwin, L.S. (ed).
- Coutts, A.D.M. 2005 (b). Slow-moving barge introduces biosecurity risk to the Marlborough Sounds, New Zealand. Pp. 29-35. *In* Hull fouling as a mechanism for marine invasive species introductions. *Proceedings of a workshop on current issues and potential management strategies*. L.S. Godwin (ed.) Honolulu, HI. February 12-13, 2003.
- Coles, S.L., R.C. DeFelice, L.G. Eldredge, J.T. Carlton. 1999. Historical and recent introductions of non-indigenous marine species into Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Hawaiian Islands. *Marine Biology*. 135: 147-158.
- Davidson, I., Sytsma, M., Ruiz, G. 2005. ANS Investigations in the Columbia River, Task IV Final Report: Preliminary investigations of biofouling of ships' hulls. Draft report to the US Coast Guard Research and Development Center. 63 pgs.
- Dodgshun T. and A. Coutts. 2002. Ships' sea chests: a "side door" for marine pests? Cawthron Institute. 9 pgs.
- Eldredge, L.G. and J.T. Carlton. 2002. Hawaiian marine bioinvasions: A preliminary assessment. *Pacific Science*. 56: 211-212.
- Falkner, M.B. 2003. Report on the California ballast water management program. Produced for the California State Legislature. California State Lands Commission. 82 pgs.
- Falkner, M., Takata, L., S. Gilmore. 2005. Report on the California Marine Invasive Species Program. Produced for the California State Legislature. California State Lands Commission. 45 pgs.
- Floerl, O. and G.J. Inglis. 2003. Boat harbour design can exacerbate hull fouling. *Austral Ecology*. 28: 116-127.
- Floerl, O., N. Norton, G. Inglis, B. Hayden, C. Middleton, M. Smith, N. Alcock, I. Fitridge. 2004. An investigation of hull cleaning and associated waste treatment options for preventing the spread of non-indigenous marine species. Final research report for Ministry of Fisheries Project ZBS2002-04. 40 pgs.
- Floerl, O. 2005. Factors that influence hull fouling on ocean-going vessels. Pp. 6-13. *In* Hull fouling as a mechanism for marine invasive species introductions: *Proceedings of a workshop on current issues and potential management strategies*. L.S. Godwin (ed.) Honolulu, HI. February 12-13, 2003.



- Floerl, O. and G.J. Inglis. 2005. Potential for the introduction and spread of marine pests by private yachts. Pp. 22-28. *In* Hull fouling as a mechanism for marine invasive species introductions: *Proceedings of a workshop on current issues and potential management strategies*. L.S. Godwin (ed.) Honolulu, HI. February 12-13, 2003.
- Floerl, O., G.J. Inglis, H.M. Marsh. 2005. Selectivity in vector management: an investigation of the effectiveness of measures used to prevent transport of non-indigenous species. *Biological Invasions*. 7: 459-475.
- Fofonoff, P.W., G.M. Ruiz, B. Steves, J.T. Carlton. 2003. In ships or on ships? Mechanisms of transfer and invasion for nonnative species to the coasts of North America. *In* *Invasive species: Vectors and management strategies*. G.M. Ruiz and J.T. Carlton (eds). Pp. 152-182.
- Foster, B.A. and R.C. Willan. 1979. Foreign barnacles transported to New Zealand on an oil platform. *New Zealand Journal of Marine and Freshwater Research*. 13: 143-149.
- Godwin, L.S. 2003. Hull fouling of maritime vessels as a pathway for marine species invasions to the Hawaiian Islands. *Biofouling*. 19 (Supplement): 123-131.
- Godwin, L.S., L.G. Eldredge, K. Gaut. 2004. The assessment of hull fouling as a mechanism for the introduction and dispersal of marine alien species in the main Hawaiian Islands. Bishop Museum Technical Report No. 28. Honolulu, HI.
- Godwin, L.S. 2005. Development of an initial framework for the management of hull fouling as a marine invasive species transport mechanism. *In*: *Hull fouling as a mechanism for marine invasive species introductions. Proceedings of a workshop on current issues and potential management strategies*. February 12-13, 2004. pp. 47-54. Godwin, L.S. (ed).
- Hay, C. and Dodgshun, T., 1997. Ecosystem Transplant? The case of the Yefim Gorbenko. *Seafood N.Z.* May 1997: 13-14
- Hewitt, C.L., Campbell, M.L., Thresher, R.E., Martin, R.B., Boyd, S., Cohen, B.F., Currie, D.R., Gomon, M.F., Keough, M.J., Lewis, J.A., Lockett, M.M., Mays, N., MacArthur, M.A., O'Hara, T.D., Poore, G.C.B., Ross, D.J., Storey, M.J., Watson, J.E., Wilson, R.S. 2004. Introduced and cryptogenic species in Port Philip Bay, Victoria, Australia. *Marine Biology*. 144: 183-202.
- International Association of Classification Societies (IACS). 2004. Classification societies – What, why, and how? Accessed March 2006. <http://www.iacs.org.uk/>.

- International Maritime Organization (IMO). 1999. Antifouling systems on ships. Resolution A.895 (21).
- International Maritime Organization (IMO). 2002. Focus on IMO: Anti-fouling systems. 31 pgs.
- International Marine Coatings. 2006. TBT free antifouling and foul release systems. Accessed October 15, 2005. [http://www.international-marine.com/newbuilding/brochures/AF\\_Range\\_Brochure.pdf](http://www.international-marine.com/newbuilding/brochures/AF_Range_Brochure.pdf).
- Lewis, J. 2002. Hull fouling as a vector for the translocation of marine organisms, Phase 3: The significance of the prospective ban on tributyltin antifouling paints on the introduction and translocation of marine pests in Australia. Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry – Australia. Report No. 2. 133 pgs.
- Marine Invasive Species Act. 2003. State of California Assembly Bill 433. 2003 Regular Session. Passed September 24, 2003.
- McEnnulty, F.R., Bax, N.J., Schaffelke, B., Campbell, M.L. 2001. A review of rapid response options for the control of ABWMAC listed introduced marine pest species and related taxa in Australian waters. CRIMP Technical Report No. 23. Hobart Australia. 101 pgs.
- Meyerson, L.A., Reaser, J.K. 2002. Biosecurity: moving towards a comprehensive approach. *BioScience*. 52: 593-600.
- Michin, D. and S. Gollasch. 2003. Fouling and ship's hulls: How changing circumstances and spawning events may result in the spread of exotic species. *Biofouling*. 19: 111-122.
- Nehring, S. 2001. After the TBT Era: Alternative anti-fouling paints and their ecological risks. *Senckenbergiana maritima*. 31(2): 341-351.
- New Zealand Ministry of Fisheries. Public consultation paper – proposed biosecurity (hull cleaning) regulations. Accessed February 8, 2006. <http://www.fish.govt.nz/sustainability/ballast/hull-cleaning/consultation.htm>
- Nichols, F.H., J.K. Thompson, and L.E. Schemel. 1990. Remarkable invasion of San Francisco Bay (California, USA) by the Asian clam *Pomtamocorbula amurensis*. II. Displacement of a former community. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*. 66: 95-101.
- Pimentel, D., R. Zuniga, and D. Morrison. 2005. Update on the environmental and economic costs associated with alien-invasive species in the United States. *Ecological Economics*. *BioScience*. 50: 53-65.

- Skerman, T.M. 1960. Ship-fouling in New Zealand waters: A survey of marine fouling organisms from vessels of the coastal and overseas trade. *New Zealand Journal of Science*. 3: 620-648.
- Railkin, A.I. 2004. *Marine Biofouling: Colonization Processes and Defenses*. CRC Press. Washington D.C. 303 pgs.
- Ranier, S.F. 1995. Potential for the introduction and translocation of exotic species by hull fouling: A preliminary assessment. Center for Research on Introduced Marine Pests. Technical Report No. 1.
- Ruiz, G.M., P.W. Fofonoff, J.T. Carlton, M.J. Wonham and A.H. Hines. 2000. Invasion of coastal marine communities in North America: apparent patterns, processes and biases. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics*. 31: 481-531.
- Ruiz, G.M., Miller, A.W., Lion, K., Steves, B. 2001. Status and trends of ballast water management in the United States. First biennial report of the National Ballast Information Clearinghouse. 45 pgs.
- Ruiz, G.M., C. Brown, G. Smith, B. Morrison, D. Ockrassa, K. Nekinaken. 2005. Analysis of biofouling organisms associated with the hulls of containerships arriving to the port of Oakland: A Pilot Study. Pp.138-151. *In* Biological Study of Container Vessels at the Port of Oakland.
- U.S. Commission on Ocean Policy. 2004. *An Ocean Blueprint for the 21st Century*. Final Report. Washington, DC. 520 pp.

## IX. APPENDICIES

## APPENDIX A

### Hull-Borne Invasive Species Workshop List of Attendees May 11, 2005 • San Francisco, CA

Marian Ashe  
California Department of Fish and Game

John Berge  
Pacific Merchant Shipping Association

David Breninger  
Recreational Boaters of California

Margot Brown  
National Boating Federation

Chris Brown  
Smithsonian Environmental Research Center

Brad Chapman  
Chevron Texaco Shipping Company LLC

Amy Chastain  
San Francisco BayKeeper

Ashley Coutts  
Cawthron Institute, Marine Biosecurity

Jeff Crooks  
Tijuana River National Estuary Research Reserve

Holly Crosson  
University of California, Davis, Department  
Environmental Science and Policy

Ian Davidson  
Portland State University

Larry Draper  
Recreational Boaters of California

Diane Edwards  
California State Water Resources Control Board,  
Division of Water Quality

Susan Ellis  
California Department of Fish and Game, Habitat  
Conservation Division

Terri Ely  
California Department of Boating and Waterways,  
Aquatic Weed Control Unit

Carl Ernst  
Marina Recreation Association

Maurya Falkner  
California State Lands Commission

Sylvain Fillion  
International Paint Company

Reinhard E. Flick  
Scripps Institution of Oceanography, Center for  
Coastal Studies

Paul Gates  
International Paint Company

Suzanne Gilmore  
California State Lands Commission

Scott Godwin  
Bernice Pauahai Bishop Museum, Hawaii

Jamie Gonzalez  
University of California Sea Grant Extension Program

Allison Gordon  
Pacific Coast Federation of Fishermen's Associations

Ted Grosholz  
University of California, Davis

Brad Gross  
California Association of Harbor Masters and Port  
Captains

000637

CALENDAR PAGE

001207

MINUTE PAGE

Jon Gurish  
California Coastal Conservancy

Greg Ruiz  
Smithsonian Environmental Research Center

Marla Harrison  
Port of Portland

Dragan Samardzic  
Matson Navigation

Jeffrey Herod  
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Sacramento/San  
Joaquin Estuary Fishery Resources Office

Jason Savarese  
National Sea Grant Law Center

Andrew Jirik  
Port of Los Angeles

Guy Seabrook  
Magellan Companies, Inc

Leigh Johnson  
University of California Sea Grant Extension Program

Nan Singhasemanon  
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Jo-Anne Kushima  
State of Hawaii, Dept. of Land & Natural Resources,  
Division of Aquatic Resources

Lisa Sniderman  
California Coastal Commission

Tim Leathers  
MRA/Cabrillo Isle Marina

Ernie Soeterik  
Sherwin Williams

Mari Lou Livingood  
Association of Marina Industries

Mike Sowby  
California Department of Fish and Game

Vivian Matuk  
California Coastal Commission

Cindy Squires  
National Marine Manufacturers Association

Karen McDowell  
San Francisco Estuary Project

Jay Stachowicz  
University of California, Davis, Section of Evolution  
and Ecology

Sarah Mongano  
California State Lands Commission

Nancy Stein  
Contra Costa County Department of Public Works

Paul Murakawa  
State of Hawaii, Dept. of Land & Natural Resources,  
Division of Aquatic Resources

David Stephens  
California State Lands Commission

William Needham  
Harbor Safety Committee of the SF Bay Region

Sean Svendsens  
Svendsen's Boat Yard

Peter Ode  
California Department of Fish and Game

Lynn Takata  
California State Lands Commission

Deborah Pennell  
Shelter Island Marina, Board of Directors MRA

Drew Talley  
San Francisco Bay National Estuary Research  
Reserve

Russ Robinson  
Recreational Boaters of California

Mariann Timms  
Marina Recreation Association

Raynor Tsuneyoshi  
California Department of Boating and Waterways

Valerie Van Way  
California State Lands Commission

M K Veloz  
Northern California Marine Association

Ted Warburton  
California Association of Harbor Masters and Port  
Captains

Kim Ward  
State Water Resources Control Board: Division of  
Water Quality

Chela Zabin  
University of Hawaii, Manoa

Jody Zaitlin  
Port of Oakland

000639

CALENDAR PAGE

001205

MINUTE PAGE

## APPENDIX B

### California State Lands Commission Technical Advisory Group Participants

\*\* Denotes participants that attended at least one Commission TAG meeting

Cesar Alvarez\*\*  
California Sea Grant Extension

Abe Doherty  
California Coastal Conservancy

Marian Ashe\*\*  
California Department of Fish and Game

Diane Edwards  
California State Water Resources Control Board

John Berge\*\*  
Pacific Merchant Shipping Association

Susan Ellis  
California Department of Fish and Game

Chris Brown  
Smithsonian Environmental Research Center

Richard Everett  
United States Coast Guard

Marina Cazorla  
California Coastal Conservancy

Schauadi Falamaki  
California Association of Port Authorities

Brad Chapman\*\*  
Chevron Texaco Shipping Company LLC

Maurya Falkner\*\*  
California State Lands Commission

Ashley Coutts\*\*  
Cawthron Institute, Marine Biosecurity

Sylvain Fillion  
International Paint Company

Jeff Crooks\*\*  
Tijuana River National Estuarine Research  
Reserve

Oliver Floerl  
National Centre for Aquatic Biodiversity and  
Biosecurity, New Zealand

Holly Crosson\*\*  
West Coast Ballast Outreach Project

Paul Gates\*\*  
International Paint Company

Ian Davidson\*\*  
Portland State University

Suzanne Gilmore\*\*  
California State Lands Commission

Nicole Dobroski\*\*  
West Coast Ballast Outreach Project

Scott Godwin  
Bernice Pauahai Bishop Museum, Hawaii



Jamie Gonzalez\*\*  
University of California Sea Grant Extension  
Program

Ted Grosholz  
University of California, Davis

Jon Gurish  
California Coastal Conservancy

Jeffrey Herod\*\*  
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Sacramento/San  
Joaquin Estuary Fishery Resources Office

Eric Holm  
Naval Surface Warfare Center, Carderock Division

Andrew Jirik  
Port of Los Angeles

Leigh Johnson  
University of California Sea Grant Extension  
Program

Giselle Johnston\*\*  
California State Lands Commission

Dalia Keroles\*\*  
California State Lands Commission

Jo-Anne Kushima\*\*  
State of Hawaii, Dept. of Land & Natural  
Resources, Division of Aquatic Resources

Jackie Mackay\*\*  
California State Lands Commission

Vivian Matuk  
California Coastal Commission

Karen McDowell\*\*  
San Francisco Estuary Project

Whitman Miller\*\*  
Smithsonian Environmental Research Center

Steve Moore  
San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control  
Board

Paul Murakawa  
State of Hawaii, Dept. of Land & Natural  
Resources, Division of Aquatic Resources

Sarah Newkirk  
The Ocean Conservancy

Peter Ode  
California Department of Fish and Game

Henry Olsen  
Matson Navigation

Stephen Philips  
Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission

Deborah Ruddock  
California Coastal Conservancy

Greg Ruiz\*\*  
Smithsonian Environmental Research Center

Dragan Samardzic\*\*  
Matson Navigation

Tim Schott  
California Association of Port Authorities

Linda Sheehan  
California CoastKeeper

Lisa Sniderman  
California Coastal Commission

Mike Sowby  
California Department of Fish and Game

Jay Stachowicz  
University of California, Davis

Lisa Swanson\*\*  
Matson Navigation

Steve Weisberg  
Southern California Coastal Research Project

Mark Sytsma\*\*  
Portland State University

Rodney Young\*\*  
Hawaii Dept. of Land and Natural Resources

Lynn Takata\*\*  
California State Lands Commission

Chela Zabin  
University of Hawaii, Manoa

Drew Talley\*\*  
San Francisco National Estuarine Research  
Reserve

Jody Zaitlin  
Port of Oakland

Kim Ward\*\*  
California State Water Resources Control Board

**APPENDIX C**  
**Summary of the Hull-Borne Invasive Species Workshop**  
**May 11, 2005**  
**San Francisco, CA**

Though the full workshop presentations and discussions examined the issue of introductions through fouling on both recreational and commercial vessels, the summary here focuses on topics that apply to the commercial industry. This text was prepared by staff of the California State Lands Commission so the agency may move forward with additional discussions regarding management recommendations for commercial vessels, as mandated by state legislation. A more complete proceedings document will be produced, to be collaboratively developed with the California Sea Grant Extension Program.

**Morning Presentations**

***Greg Ruiz, Smithsonian Environmental Research Center:  
Hull-Borne Aquatic Invasive Species Overview:***

Dr. Greg Ruiz provided an overview on aquatic/marine/estuarine invasions, and specifically provided information on the relative importance of hull fouling and ballast water as vehicles for the introduction of alien species. Commercial shipping is the largest means by which species are introduced to North America. The rate of invasion due to this "vector" has increased exponentially in North America since 1790. These increases have been largest on the Pacific Coast. Ballast water and fouling are, in turn, the dominant shipping sub-vectors responsible for the largest number of invasions. The number of invasions likely due to fouling is growing in North America, and the rate of invasions through this vector may be increasing as well.

The Smithsonian has been conducting additional studies on the importance of the commercial vessel fouling vector. A preliminary estimate was conducted on the amount of vessel surface area arriving to the United States that may be colonized by fouling organisms. The estimate, based on vessel arrival data and vessel particulars from Lloyd's Registry, suggested that some 130-150 million m<sup>2</sup> of colonizable surface arrived to U.S. ports annually between 1999 and 2001. The Smithsonian is also conducting fouling plate surveys at sites throughout the coastal United States, British Columbia, and Alaska. Plates made of PVC, plastic and wood are deployed at sites to collect fouling organisms, later retrieved, and attached organisms are identified. Such studies will allow researchers to better understand the relationship between the number of organisms transported to North America via shipping (propagule supply), and the number of organisms that successfully establish reproductive populations (invasion success).

***Scott Godwin, P.B. Bishop Museum:  
Marine Invasive Species Transported by Vessel Hull Fouling: Potential Management Approaches***

Hawaii has been highly impacted by invasive species, with approximately 343 introduced through human mechanisms, and approximately 212 are believed to have been introduced via vessel fouling. In 2003, the state began formulating an information framework to minimize introductions through the fouling vector. Prior to stakeholder discussions, studies were conducted on the dynamics of Hawaii port arrivals, and field surveys of fouling communities to inform the stakeholder meetings. High risk vessels fell into those with regular, predictable arrivals, and those that do not behave regularly (stochastic):

Stochastic, High Risk:

- Towed Vessel Platforms (i.e. floating dry docks, barges, drilling platforms)
- Derelict vessels
- Decommissioned Military
- Personal Craft

Predictable, High Risk:

- Towed Vessel Platforms

The stakeholder input effort began with a 2-day workshop in February 2003, and continued during meetings held through July 2003. The overarching goal adopted was, "Minimize marine alien species introductions by hull fouling," since absolute prevention (no introductions) was deemed less realistic. The management strategies ultimately recommended by the task force to achieve this goal fell into three categories: proactive, reactive, and post-event.

- Proactive Measures:
  - Vessel traffic monitoring – to identify and respond to high risk situations
  - Strong inter-agency communication, particularly to assist with the monitoring effort of recreational vessel arrivals
  - Creation of a risk matrix (see notes below) to identify high risk situations that may warrant investigation
  - Education and outreach component to increase awareness of the issue with the maritime public
- Reactive Measure:
  - Rapid response investigation of high risk events/vessels identified during the proactive stage
- Post-event Measures:
  - Quarantine
  - Cleaning requirement & procedures for proper cleaning

A very preliminary risk matrix was drafted to prioritize high risk events that may warrant investigation. Factors that lead to a high risk determination were:

- Priority (high risk) vessels
- Last port of call was outside of Hawaii
- Vessel does not observe compliance standards, such as local codes of practice, or IMO International Safety Management codes
- Length of time vessel was inactive or laid up (long time = higher risk)

**Ashley Coutts, Cawthron Institute (New Zealand):**

***An Overview of the Management of Biofouling on Vessels in New Zealand.***

Vessel fouling is considered to be a very important vector for New Zealand invasives. Known invasives have originated from all over the world, with the top 3 source regions being the Europe/U.K./Mediterranean (48%), the United States (13%), and Asia/Japan (11%).

Management of the vector was initiated due to a Russian fishing vessel that arrived in 1993, remaining in New Zealand for 18 months with 90 tones of fouling. Pre-border management controls that have been put in place since then are:

Fishing Industry Codes of Practice:

- All chartered foreign owned or sourced fishing vessels must be substantially free from plant or animal growth prior to entering New Zealand's Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ).
- If it is not free of fouling, the vessel must be inspected and cleaned prior to departure.
- If it arrives to New Zealand and inspections reveal the vessel to be significantly fouled, the vessel is cleaned in a manner that doesn't release organisms to the environment.

**Outreach (primarily geared towards recreational boaters)**

- Distribute information packs in the Pacific Islands (where personal vessels often originate), and at popular ports of entry to New Zealand.
- Distribute materials in yachting magazines.

**Hull fouling questionnaire on ballast water reporting form (commercial vessels)**

- When and where was the vessel last dry-docked and cleaned?
- Has the vessel been laid-up for 3 months or more since it was last dry-docked and cleaned? If yes, state when and where?
- Do you intend to clean the hull of the vessel in New Zealand? If yes, state when and where?

Current Knowledge of Fouling:

- Merchant vessels have been observed to carry a substantial diversity of fouling exotics.
- Fouling extent is related to the age of paint, vessel speed, and voyage duration.
- Fouling is higher in sheltered areas or those lacking good antifouling paint coverage (i.e. recesses, dry dock support strips, sea chest gratings).

Current Research

- En route survival of fouling organisms
- Evaluation of organism viability after various cleaning methods are used
- Fouling type and extent across various vessel types arriving to New Zealand
- Efficacy of hull cleaning methods.

***Dragan Samardzic, Matson Navigation:  
Commercial Vessel Fouling Control***

Dragan Samardzic provided an overview of Matson's corporate history, and characteristics of their regular trade routes to Hawaii and Guam from California. Fouling control is important to commercial shippers in order to protect the environment, reduce drag and save fuel, deliver goods more swiftly, and to protect the hull. Factors that affect fouling appear to be the type and condition of antifouling paint, locations where a vessel travels, the seabed type at ports and anchorages, and the speed of the vessel. U.S. flagged vessels typically go into dry dock approximately every 5 years for repairs, hull cleaning, and re-application of antifouling paint. As with Matson, hulls may be inspected more frequently by divers, and in-water cleaning occurs as needed.

***Sylvain Fillion, International Paint Company:  
Antifouling and Foul-Release Technologies***

Sylvain Fillion provided an overview of the major antifouling (biocidal) and fouling-release (non-biocidal) coatings and their ability to reduce fouling on commercial vessels.

Biocidal coatings involve a "soluble binder" which is slowly released into the water and prevents organisms from attaching. The three main biocidal coatings are rosin-based, self polishing co-polymer (SPC), and a hybrid type (rosin/SPC combination). The best performing but most expensive are the SPC types, followed by the hybrid which is less expensive but less effective. The least expensive, but least

effective biocidal coating is the rosin type, with an effective life of approximately 36 months on exposed portions of the hull.

Fouling-release coatings (non-biocidal) do not contain soluble binders, and are ultra smooth coatings that offer lower frictional resistance, and require less coatings on a vessel when compared to their biocidal counterparts. With such coatings, organisms may attach, but are easily knocked off with vessel movement or gentle removal. Vessels show little fouling after 25 months (primarily slime). After 25 months, vessels exhibit low amounts of fouling.

***Jason Savarese, National Sea Grant Law Center:  
Legal Overview***

Jason provided an overview of local, national and international regulations related to vessel fouling control, antifouling paints, and government bodies involved with invasive species policy development. Though regulations related to both commercial and recreational vessels were covered, the summary here highlights those policies that relate to commercial vessels.

**Regulations for Vessel Fouling:**

- **Victoria, Australia:** Vessels of less than 200 tons must discard fouled organisms on land.
- **New Zealand:** Fishing industry has adopted codes of practice to clean vessels before leaving port, and require vessel maintenance and movement information from vessels in conjunction with ballast water reporting form (also see summary of presentation by Ashley Coutts).
- **Australian and New Zealand Environment and Conservation Council (ANZECC):** Adopted codes of practice for commercial vessels that discourage in-water hull cleaning wherever possible (also see talk by Ashley Coutts).
- **United States:** U.S. Code of Federal Regulation 33, and California law AB 433 requires rinsing of anchor chains of organisms at their place of origin, and regular cleaning of hulls, piping and tanks. Hawaii has formulated a management framework for the issue that may lead to the implementation of policies in the future (see presentation by Scott Godwin).

**Antifouling Coating Policies**

- **The International Maritime Organization:** The convention on the Control of Harmful Antifouling Systems on Ships bans the use of organotins on vessels, or requires vessels to cover such coatings so they do not leach after January 1, 2008. However, ratification had not been achieved by the 2003 implementation date, and the convention is not yet in force.
- **Other Countries** have adopted regulations banning or restricting biocidal antifoulant use. **Australia** banned Tributyl tin (TBT) in 2006. The **Netherlands** banned TBT for recreational vessels in 1999, but allowed its use on commercial vessels. After 2000, antifoulants may be used in the **European Union** only after evaluation and approval.
- **In the United States,** the EPA has adopted recommended TBT discharge values for application with the Clean Water Act and other EPA regulations. California, Washington and Alaska restrict the use of TBT on commercial vessels.

***Alternative Fouling Control and Water Quality Considerations:  
Jamie Gonzalez, UC Sea Grant Extension Program***

Though there is an international convention for the eventual phase out of TBT, biocidal copper-based paints will remain legal in many areas, and will likely be used quite commonly to prevent fouling. Due to

the low circulation of enclosed basins and harbors, the leached metals build up in the water and sediments, causing various problems for organisms residing in them. A non-toxic bottom paint demonstration project was conducted by Sea Grant in San Diego on a small number of (recreational) boats, to test the efficacy of non-biocidal coatings. The results indicate that epoxy and ceramic-epoxy coatings may potentially last longer than copper paints, but require more frequent cleaning. In the long term they may be more cost effective under certain use conditions, though they are more expensive initially.

### **Speaker Question and Answer Session**

A brief question and answer session was held for participants to pose questions to speakers.

In response to a question on their opinion with regard to the balance between water quality (especially with relation to biocidal paints) and the prevention of fouling, speakers suggested that; 1) the goals of the society should drive the management priorities, and 2) In the case of Hawaii, the management recommendations aimed towards minimizing fouling introductions did not conflict with the water quality regulations in place, but tended to compliment each other. The water quality issues were entrusted to the regulatory agencies that had more expertise and experience dealing with them.

In response to a question about the typical hull husbandry practices of the whole commercial fleet, it was noted that international standards for the cleaning of vessels exist depending on vessel class. The U.S. fleet follows these standards. In the case of Hawaii, it was not the U.S. flagged vessels that typically posed a the most risk. The "flags of convenience" vessels and foreign fishing vessels typically pose the most severe risk, though these comprise a small percentage of the entire fleet that arrive to Hawaii.

### **Afternoon: Breakout Discussion Session**

During the afternoon, participants were separated into three discussion groups, each consisting of a mix of scientists, regulators, recreational vessel stakeholders, and commercial shipping stakeholders. Groups were asked to address five questions:

1. Does vessel/boat fouling pose an invasive species risk that needs to be addressed?
2. What needs to be considered in solving the problem of hull transport of invasive species by recreational and commercial vessels?
3. Where, how, and when should vessels be maintained to prevent fouling ANS introductions?
4. What information gaps need to be closed?
5. What are the outreach and educational needs for AIS prevention in California for recreational and commercial boats?

Following the breakout discussions, all participants were reconvened, and representatives from each presented a synopsis of their respective discussions. Points of general (but not necessarily unanimous) agreement or discussion are included in this summary.

#### ***Question 1. Does vessel/boat fouling pose an invasive species risk that needs to be addressed?***

The majority of members in 2 of the 3 groups believed that fouling posed a risk that should be addressed. One group felt that fouling posed a risk, but the severity of that risk, and where the majority of the risk fell with respect to recreational or commercial vessels was unclear.

**Question 2. What needs to be considered in solving the problem of hull transport of invasive species by recreational and commercial vessels?**

- Because it is not possible to predict what the next problematic invader might be, because control is generally much more costly than prevention, and because eradication is not typically successful, consider a vector-based management approach that minimizes introductions via the fouling vector as a whole.
- Consider incorporating a risk-based system that prioritizes high risk vessels or situations. Factors that may be used to evaluate the risk of a vessel or situation to consider are:
  - Vessel behavior (speed, sitting time)
  - Vessel type
  - Hull husbandry practices
  - Season
  - Age of antifouling paint
  - Vessel voyage route
  - Port region/location
- Consider a management framework based on the hull husbandry practices of vessels and boats (see question 3 below).
- Examine existing program models (i.e. Australia, New Zealand, Hawaii) to observe lessons learned and to avoid pitfalls.
- Consider water quality issues and regulations with respect to biocidal coatings.
- Any management measures proposed should incorporate a level of simplicity.

**Question 3. Where, how, and when should vessels be maintained to prevent fouling ANS introductions?**

Though there was no general consensus on what type of hull maintenance procedures should be adopted, discussions generated several potential practices that could be adopted, and the advantages and disadvantages of each. The points summarized below were topics that were raised by at least 2 groups.

- Periodically maintain antifouling coatings, with a preference for foul-release coatings (non-biocidal). One group suggested that coating application or cleaning periodicity could be certified to verify that a vessel has been maintained properly. At this time, however, it is recognized that non-toxic coatings are initially very costly, and are still currently undergoing testing and further development.
- Remove fouling organisms regularly from hulls as well as from other areas such as sea chests, anchors, etc. Ideally for ANS prevention, this would be done out of the water, however, this process is expensive and time consuming. In-water cleaning is more common and less costly, but current methods generally result in the release of fouling organisms into harbors or ports.
- One group suggested that a code for "Best Management Practices" could be adopted for fouling maintenance.
- Another group suggested that vessels could be cleaned upon departure from California and inspected upon return.



**Question 4. What information gaps need to be closed?**

- The relative risk posed by vessels based on vessel type, vessel behavior, and port conditions that increase potential risk (i.e. location, temperature).
- Current maintenance practices of vessels. One group suggested that this could be advanced through a survey that asks vessel operators or owners:
  - How long was the vessel at the last port of call?
  - When was paint last applied to the vessel hull?
  - When was the vessel last in dry dock for hull cleaning?
- Extent of biofouling as it is affected by factors such as:
  - Vessel type
  - Hull maintenance practices
  - Vessel activity

**Question 5. What are the outreach and educational needs for AIS prevention in California for recreational and commercial boats?**

- In general, outreach and education was deemed to be very important, and was particularly advocated for and by the recreational boating community. Potential vehicles for outreach discussed, therefore, applied largely to the recreational community. Suggestions that could be applied to the commercial industry included:
  - Advertisements/articles in industry publications (magazines)
  - Distribution of posters and brochures to commercial community
  - Internet/email distribution of information
- Communication between agencies involved with the shipping industry should be facilitated. In Hawaii, this is the major vehicle by which many high risk vessel movements are tracked (i.e. fishing vessels, barges, etc...).
- Increased communication between scientists and commercial/recreational stakeholders regarding magnitude of the invasive species problem.

**APPENDIX D**  
**Summary of the California State Lands Commission**  
**Technical Advisory Group Meeting**

**August 3, 2005**  
**Sacramento, CA**

**Overview: Advisory Group Goals and Process**

Following the welcome and participant introductions, a presentation was given of the technical advisory group goals (TAG), anticipated advisory group meeting process, and the information that will likely be considered for the final legislative report.

**TAG Function:** As outlined in Assembly Bill 433 passed in 2003 (AKA "The Marine Invasive Species Act"), the function of this TAG is to serve as consultant to the CSLC in its analysis of the relative risk of non-ballast, commercial vessel based vectors for the release of nonindigenous species to California waters. Further consultation with the U.S. Coast Guard and the State Water Quality Control Board is also mandated by the legislation. The CSLC will then submit a report summarizing an analysis and recommendations to the state Legislature by March 1, 2006.

**Source of Report Input:** The CSLC anticipates several sources of input for the final legislative report. In addition to TAG discussions, these will include:

- Review of scientific and grey literature on vessel fouling.
- Marine Bioinvasions Conference Discussions: The U.S. Coast Guard and Biosecurity New Zealand organized an informal discussion on the risk and management of vessel fouling for species introductions at the 4<sup>th</sup> Biennial Marine Bioinvasions Conference in New Zealand. The CSLC will participate, share information with the TAG, and incorporate applicable information into the report.
- Analyses of existing California vessel arrivals data. Additional analyses may also be completed and/or considered, but will be dependent on data availability, information needs uncovered, and time constraints.

000650

CALENDAR PAGE

001215

MINUTE PAGE

### ***Anticipated Framework for TAG Meetings***

Though this framework is subject to modification, it is anticipated that a total of 4-5 TAG meetings will be held through December 2005 or January 2006. The first few meetings are or were intended to mutually inform all TAG participants, so discussions may proceed from a base knowledge of the issue. The current meeting continues the information sharing process begun during the joint workshop held on May 11, 2005 (see attached summary). The 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting will be scheduled for late September or early October, during which discussions will begin on recommendation frameworks. The 4<sup>th</sup> meeting is anticipated for November or December 2005, and will likely continue discussions around potential recommendations. If consensus or majority recommendations are not reached, a final 5<sup>th</sup> meeting will be held in early January.

### ***Review of May 11<sup>th</sup> Workshop***

An overview was given of speaker presentations and break-out group discussions from the May 11<sup>th</sup> workshop. Major points presented by speakers that applied to the commercial vessel side of the issue were reviewed (see attached workshop summary, and power point presentation from the August 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting).

### ***"Non-Ballast, Vessel-Based Vectors": What should this include? Can the list be prioritized?***

AB 433 lists several explicit areas on a vessel that shall be considered during the risk analysis of fouling introductions. These, "...include, but [will] not be limited to, hulls, sea chests, sea suction grids, other hull apertures, in-water propellers, chains, anchors, piping and tanks." The group was asked to discuss the list, if any area of importance should be added to the list, and if the items could be prioritized.

#### ***"Non-Ballast, Vessel-Based Vectors"***

Two additional vessel areas/categories were suggested as a component to consider with the AB 433 list: **rudders**, and **"non-hull protected areas"**. Non-hull protected areas would include regions of a vessel that are sheltered from water shear forces when a vessel is underway, such as bow thruster tunnels, rope guards, intakes or grills. Ashley Coutts noted that he has observed organisms in these anomaly areas during the course of his research. It was suggested that an alternative method for organizing vessel regions according to risk could be to split items into "laminar areas" (lower risk, i.e. exposed hulls) and "protected areas" (areas protected from shear forces – higher risk).

It was asked if the mandate was intended to include NIS transport connected to the transfer of goods, for example, those that may be moved with pallets or in packing material.

It was also noted that organisms which do not attach to the vessel surface and are thus not technically "fouling" organisms, may also pose a risk for introductions (Miller). These may be located on interstitial areas of the vessel or within sea chests, and are associated more frequently with slow moving vessels. For example, Ashley Coutts found large mature organisms, including decapod crustaceans (i.e. crabs) in sea chests.

#### ***Prioritizing Parts of a Vessel:***

In many cases, the categorization of parts of a vessel into higher or lower risk categories was complex, as several factors interact with each other. A risk determination, therefore, will often depend on a number of variables acting in concert (i.e. location on a vessel, maintenance practices, vessel behavior, vessel location, etc.). In general, highest priority vessel parts could be considered a higher risk on all vessels, regardless of other factors. Lower priority areas on are likely low for many vessels, but could be considered a high risk on some depending on other factors. For example, the laminar hull of a fast moving vessel (low risk factors) that hasn't been repainted in some time and has spent substantial time in its last port of call could pose a significant risk.

Given these complications, areas that are likely of **higher risk** would include:

- **Hulls:** Laminar areas where antifouling paint coating is thin or old (i.e. dry dock support strips). Portions sheltered from shear forces.
- **Sea Chests:** Extensive fouling communities including large mobile organisms have been observed to inhabit sea chests.
- **Sea Suction Grids:** Intake grids have been observed to accumulate fouling.
- **Non-Hull Protected Areas:** described above.
- **Rudders:** Areas sheltered from shear forces, such as the stem, can accumulate fouling.

Though the designation of risk could depend on other interacting variables, **lower risk** areas may include:

- **Laminar Hull** areas that are well maintained (cleaned and painted).
- **Rudder** areas that are well maintained (cleaned and painted) and subject to the shear forces of the propeller.

Several of the items listed in AB 433 required clarification, and more information will be obtained prior to the next meeting in October.

- **Tanks:** It was unclear what type of tank this refers to (i.e. ballast, grey water?).
- **Piping:** It was unclear if this referred to the areas around intakes and outtakes or all piping.

For some vessel regions, the relative risk for fouling accumulation was unclear due to lack of knowledge or research:

- **In-Water Propellers:** Could be a lower priority due to the movement of the propeller, and safety issues associated with a fouled propeller. Chevron noted that they coat propellers with self-polishing antifouling paints (Chapman).
- **Anchors:** Some companies, such as Chevron, equip vessels with automatic mechanisms that rinse anchors with ambient port water as they are brought aboard (Chapman).
- **Rudders:** It is suspected that main portions exposed to shear forces may pose a lower risk, while protected areas may accumulate fouling (Coutts).

#### **Environmental Characteristics That Influence Fouling**

A pre-prepared list of characteristics was created based on the May 11<sup>th</sup> workshop, and the TAG was asked if there were environmental factors that would result in more or less fouling on a vessel, and if these could be prioritized. As with the prioritization of locations on a vessel, the relationship between level of fouling and environmental factors can be complex. Numerous variables likely interact and result in varying amounts of fouling, and varying rates of species survival.

**Osmotic (salinity) and temperature stresses** may be an important driver for the survival of organisms associated with vessels, and should be considered. It was noted that the relationship between survival and these variables is very complex, and more research needs to be conducted to better understand them. Several points for consideration were discussed.

- **Rapid and dramatic changes in salinity or temperature** are stressful for many organisms. In a management context, vessels arriving to the Great Lakes from high salinity ports, for example, may be a lower concern than those from other freshwater ports. Conversely, it was noted that voyages within the same latitude (similar temperatures) have been found to be especially problematic in New Zealand (Coutts).

- **Some organisms are adapted to tolerate wide fluctuations in temperature and salinity.** The issue was raised that, in theory, transits to and from high and low salinity organisms may serve to select for the hardiest NIS. Widely fluctuating conditions could possibly result in vessels arriving to port with organisms that are the most tolerant and thus more likely to invade.
- **The frequency and duration of freshwater exposure** is important for seagoing vessels (and organisms). Vessels that arrive to Portland, then sail to freshwater portions of the Columbia River, and thereafter return to Portland, are observed to be less fouled than when they initially arrived (Davidson). Also, observations from international voyages to and from Alaska, suggest that trips shorter than 12 hours are related to better survival (Coutts).

In addition to the physical tolerances of potential NIS, the variability of environmental salinity and temperature can be complex, and can be influenced by a number of factors that are not as straightforward as season or latitude. Several considerations were discussed.

- **Salinity will generally decrease in port areas during periods of high rain or snowmelt.** This occurs, for example, in Alaskan harbors. Conversely, periods of little freshwater input will generally result in higher salinities.
- **Depth of vessel keel:** A deeper keel would expose an organism to higher salinities, relative to shallower portions. Even if a vessel enters an estuary with a fresh surface salinity, deeper portions of the estuary and the vessel may experience higher salinities. Temperature, likewise, will vary with depth.
- **The sea chest environment may experience wide temperature and salinity fluctuations,** as ambient water is taken into a vessel through it for vessel operations. Nonetheless, they have been observed to have significant fouling communities.

#### ***Bottom Type***

During the May 11<sup>th</sup> workshop, invited speaker Dragan Samardzic of Matson Navigation indicated that the harbor seafloor type is a factor that influences fouling, but the TAG was unfamiliar with this relationship. Lisa Swanson will touch base with Dragan and clarify.

#### **Vessel Behavior and Maintenance Practices That Influence Fouling**

As with environmental characteristics, the TAG was asked to discuss and prioritize vessel behaviors and maintenance practices that influence fouling. Research by Ashley Coutts revealed a striking relationship between the age of antifouling paint, voyage speed and voyage duration. Again, fouling levels can be influenced by several factors acting together, and consideration of any one alone would not be adequate to evaluate risk. In general the priority factors were considered to be:

- **Vessel Inactive/Layover Time:** The more frequently a vessel is sedentary, the more fouling it accumulates.
- **Vessel Speed:**
  - **"Fast" vessels** traveling approximately 15 KTS or faster may be considered a lower risk. Vessels traveling at 22 KTS or above for at least 3 hours has very little fouling (Coutts).
  - **"Slow" vessels** traveling approximately 10 KTS or slower are a high risk. Vessels that typically travel at 3 knots or less will have extensive fouling.
- **Age of Paint:** The older the antifouling paint, the higher the fouling. Studies in Tasmania indicate that copper based antifouling coatings less than 663 days old had the lowest levels of fouling (Coutts). Thereafter, fouling increased dramatically.
- **Voyage Duration:** Shorter voyages pose a higher risk.

- **Age of Vessel/Vessel Flag:** This factor is often correlated with the maintenance practices of the vessel owners. Companies that can afford new vessels, are also more able to keep them well maintained, and less fouled. These are also often correlated with the vessel's country of registry (Coutts). The maintenance of vessels are very dependent on operators, and poorly managed vessels/companies (i.e. irregularly scheduled, irregularly routed tramp vessels) should be a priority (Chapman).
- **Last Port of Call:** In New Zealand, a last port of call with a similar latitude is considered a higher risk.

#### **Hull Maintenance and Vessel Classification Societies**

John Berge of PMSA provided the TAG with information on classification societies, and their relationship to vessel hull maintenance. Classification societies are private (non-governmental) organizations that establish and apply vessel design and maintenance standards for vessels. Societies certify vessels that are maintained according to rules established by that society for a particular vessel type. The vast majority of the world fleet belongs to one of the 10 major societies, as current certification is important for insurance purposes.

Classification society rules include requirements for periodic hull maintenance. Though these are directed towards ensuring safety and structural integrity rather than NIS prevention, the frequency with which most vessels routinely clean hulls are dependent on the requirements of their classification. Prior to this meeting, John Berge conducted an informal survey of PMSA members on their hull cleaning practices, and those that responded (5) indicated that they typically follow the requirements of their classification society. In general these are:

- Dry dock every 5 years with extensions possible with favorable interim in-water inspections.
- Interim in-water inspections and cleanings (diver):
  - Self polishing coatings: 24-36 months after dry dock
  - Other Coatings: Every 6 months.

Dry docking occurs more frequently under certain circumstances:

- As a vessel ages, societies generally require more frequent out-of-water inspections
- In the event of an emergency, or an incident that raises concerns for hull integrity (i.e. significant scraping or bumping)

Due to the scarcity of dry docks available scheduling is very difficult, so vessels are generally not dry docked more frequently than needed or required. Dry docking is also expensive. Brad Chapman indicated that for Chevron, each day in dry dock costs approximately one million dollars for the docking, cleaning, and vessel repairs.

There is generally not a requirement to recoat antifouling paint during required dry docking intervals, however, most operators take advantage of the opportunity to clean, and paint or touch up their hulls. Cleaning and repainting during these periods is also in the best interest of the operators, due to safety concerns and costs associated with reduced fuel efficiency from fouled laminar hull areas. Many vessels conduct frequent performance tests to evaluate fuel efficiency, and conduct in-water (diver) cleaning accordingly (Berge). In-water cleaning takes approximately 1 day (Chapman).

**Special Area Requirements:** Vessels operating in certain areas or routes may also be required to maintain vessels more frequently. For example, all vessels operating in Alaska's Prince William Sound are inspected annually, and are taken out of the water every two years (Chapman).

**Sea Chest Maintenance:** Sea chests are coated and/or cleaned less frequently than laminar areas, as they are generally of less concern for fuel efficiency, and can only be accessed during dry dock. Cleaning may occur once every 10-15 years as needed, and the sea chest of a vessel nearing the end of its operational life may not be cleaned or painted.

**Action Items**

- Clarify definition of items from AB 433 list of parts of a vessel that should be considered: "tanks" and "piping"
- Determine if AB 433 applies to NIS introductions related to vessel cargo.
- Locate upcoming paper by J. Crooks that observed that NIS had a survival advantage over natives in harbor environments with relatively high contaminant concentrations. (Tally)
- Locate paper by Michin on the temperature and salinity conditions that trigger fouling community spawning events.
- Lisa Swanson will clarify with Dragan Samardzic regarding the relationship between sea bottom type and fouling.
- Contact Keith Hayes who has been studying risk assessment models for NIS based on environmental factors.

**APPENDIX E**  
**Summary of the California State Lands Commission**  
**Technical Advisory Group Meeting**

**October 13, 2005**  
**Sacramento, CA**

**West Coast Ballast Outreach Project Update**

Following welcome and introductions, Holly Crosson, Project Coordinator for the West Coast Ballast Outreach Project (Sea Grant Extension) provided a program update. The project has received funding for 3 additional years, during which Holly and Program Representative Nicole Dobroski will continue the outreach mission of the project. Planned activities include:

- Updated reprint of the "Stop Ballast Water Invasions" poster and associated brochure
- Re-initiation of the Ballast Exchange newsletter with expanded distribution
- Coordination with the California Maritime Academy on the development of a ballast related seminar series
- Creation of a new project website

Though the program's grant directs that the Project's efforts be focused on ballast water, there is the potential for other NIS issues, such as vessel fouling, to be addressed to a lesser extent.

**TAG Input Framework – Meeting Goals**

The overall framework for the TAG input process was reviewed. The goals of this third meeting were to examine existing management frameworks in other countries/states for vessel fouling and to discuss options for the California to consider. Staff intends to utilize discussions from today's meeting to construct "straw-men" management scenarios for discussion, criticism, deconstruction and/or revision at the next (4<sup>th</sup>) meeting, planned for November or early December.

The TAG's final input to the CSLC is not required to be in any specific format. Considerations put forward may be explicit or general (i.e. guideline-like), and the final format will be up to the TAG. It does not necessarily need to be presented in a written document. AB 433 states only that the CSLC must consult with an advisory group (the TAG), and consider this input during the formulation of recommendations for the report to the state Legislature.

**Action Items from Prior Meeting (August 3, 2005)**

**Non-Ballast Vessel Based Vectors List:** Linda Sheehan (California Coast Keeper) was contacted for clarification on intent of AB 433 with regard to the type(s) of piping and tanks that were meant for consideration by this TAG, and if cargo-related NIS (such as those associated with packing material) were intended for consideration. She indicated that the terms were meant to have broad application towards anything that may involve NIS.

The Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (USDA) announced that as of September 16, 2005 wood packing material (i.e. wooden pallets, boxes, crates, etc.) must be heat treated or fumigated prior to entering the United States to reduce the risk of pest introductions. The APHIS regulation would presumably address the issue of introductions via packing materials.

A question was raised whether recreational boats carried on commercial vessels might be subject to consideration by the TAG, for example, if they were fouled and later placed in a California



harbor. Dragan Samardzic noted that during his years working on commercial vessels, he had never witnessed such a situation.

**Fouling NIS Survival and Copper Contamination:** Jeff Crooks summarized the findings of his recent study that compared the diversity of nonindigenous, and native fouling organisms in the San Francisco Bay Area (Tiburon) when exposed to varying concentrations of copper contamination. The results indicated that the diversity of natives declined with increasing contamination, while the diversity of NIS did not. These results suggest that contamination may have some bearing on the vulnerability of a system to invasion, in addition to traditional factors such as propagule pressure (number of organisms). The results are currently being drafted into a manuscript for publication.

**NIS Transfer from Vessel to Port (Michin and Gollasch 2003):** Ian Davidson provided a copy of a paper suggested during the last meeting, which described the effects of temperature on fouling introductions. Four mechanisms by which organisms attached to vessels can be transferred to a recipient port were also described:

1. A rise in sea temperature less than 3.6 °F can trigger a wide range of species to spawn
2. Mobile species associated with fouling communities, such as crabs, can simply drop off
3. In-water cleaning releases viable organisms from a vessel to the water column or sea floor
4. The waste disposal practices of dry dock facilities may result in NIS discharge with effluent to a port.

The waste disposal practices of commercial dry docks in California are governed by National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permits issued by the Regional Water Quality Control Boards under the authority of the Clean Water Act. The San Francisco dry dock is prohibited from discharging effluent directly into the waters of the state. Following repair operations, wash-down water is collected in holding tanks and discharged into the City of San Francisco's Treatment plant. Since the Regional Boards may have varying requirements for such discharges, Staff will investigate disposal practices of commercial dry docks located in Southern California.

#### **Sandy Sea Bottoms and Fouling Accumulation**

Dragan Samardzic clarified that the information shared during the May 11<sup>th</sup> workshop (vessels moored in sandy bottom areas tend to accumulate fouling faster than in other areas) was based on personal observation from his years working in the merchant shipping industry.

#### **Styela Clava (a Sea Squirt) Invasion in New Zealand**

Ashley Coutts shared news on a recently discovered invasion of a sea squirt to New Zealand. In August, the presence of *Styela clava* in Auckland (North Island) was confirmed by a scientist visiting from the United Kingdom for the Marine Bioinvasions Conference. Since then, it has also been observed in Lyttleton Harbor (South Island).

The species devastated the Canadian mussel aquaculture industry by smothering mussel lines and competing for food, resulting in a ~40% loss of production. There are concerns that it may cause similar impacts to New Zealand's mussel farming industry. Originally from Korea and introduced to Australia in the 1970's, the New Zealand invasion likely originated from Australia via vessel fouling. Larvae are only viable for 24 hours, and are thus not likely to have been transported via ballast water. A survey is currently underway to ascertain the geographic extent of the invasion, and to decide what management measures might be taken.

#### **Existing Vessel Fouling Management Practices (See appended Table, pg. 8)**

A table of management practices considered or adopted in other states/nations was distributed to the group prior to the meeting, and quickly reviewed. Strategies included:

- Codes of practice (antifouling paint application, cleaning periodicity, in-water cleaning restrictions/bans)
- Survey (New Zealand): vessel behavior/maintenance
- Risk-Assessment
- Regulations (Australia, vessels <25 m): Requirements for hull condition prior to entering Australian waters

**Clarification of Merchant Classification Society Requirements:** (See amended table, pg. 8). (Samardzic) The periodicity of interim in-water cleanings are not mandated, but are generally completed as noted in the table (every 2-3 years for self-polishing coatings), and are typically dictated by fuel consumption performance. Frequency of diver inspections is typically dependent on company requirements (Matson performs these quarterly).

Companies strive to control levels of fouling, as heavy fouling can only be removed through scraping, often down to exposed metal. Hard scraping removes antifouling coatings, eliminating protection from future attachment, and vessel operators prefer to avoid it. For example, Dragan Samardzic once observed vessels that had been stationary for 3-9 months in the tropics that had accumulated incredibly large and thick fouling organisms (esp. barnacles). Such fouling can only be remedied via scraping. It is uncommon to observe operators that continue running vessels without regard to fouling control. (Samardzic)

**Effectiveness Codes of Practice and Surveys (Coutts, New Zealand):** It was asked whether there was some sense for how widely applied and how effective non-mandatory codes of practice where. Initially, compliance was limited; however, compliance appears to have increased even without government enforcement for several reasons:

- Growing public awareness and support for biosecurity – education and outreach are very important
- Industry/company desire to avoid the hassle and embarrassment of being responsible for a new introduction (i.e. 1993 Russian trawler)
- The point above appears to have resulted in some level of industry self-policing

The vast majority of commercial vessels are clean, with the exception of the difficult to reach nooks and crannies on any individual vessel. The majority of ocean-going recreational boats (i.e. yachts) are also clean, as most owners have the incentive and financial ability to maintain them. It is the exceptional, stochastic vessel types/events that pose the most risk, such as vessels that travel at slow speeds, military vessels that are sold or moved after being laid up, the small minority of vessels/owners uninterested in maintenance, etc. It was this logic that led to the development of the Hawaii risk matrix.

The survey included on the ballast water declaration appears to serve mainly as an information gathering tool, rather than for targeted investigation or enforcement. By the time a form is received and processed, the vessel has typically departed.

**Can it be assumed that risk factors observed in New Zealand apply to California?**

(Ruiz) With the caveat that direct studies are lacking the Northern Hemisphere, it is likely that, in general the characteristics of highest risk vessels for California will be very similar to those in New Zealand (slow movers, long lay-up). Also as in the Southern Hemisphere, the expectation is that fouling on any given vessel will be generally low with small “hot-spots” of heavier fouling (the “nooks and crannies”). However, the specific magnitude of risk for North America is not clear. Even for the Southern Hemisphere where the majority of recent research has been conducted, studies are limited, covering small sample sizes, a limited number of vessel types, vessel behaviors, cleaning practices, and routes. How the diversity of fouling organisms on vessels in North America will stack up is unknown.

### **Priority Research Questions and Information Needs**

Given the lack of research/information on vessel fouling as a NIS vector in North America and California, CSLC anticipates that further data gathering will likely be included as a recommendation. The TAG was asked which questions might be the most important for directing future management options and for furthering the basic science of the field.

**Surveys on the species and extent of biota arriving to California ports via commercial vessel fouling** were considered one of the highest priorities. Discussion indicated that such studies should be coupled with information on several vessel variables to elucidate relationships with NIS introduction risk:

- Vessel type – include a broad cross section of vessel types
- Vessel behavior - voyage speed, lay over time, etc.
- Maintenance practices - frequency of in-water cleaning and out of water cleaning
- Transit route(s) – prior ports of call. Supplemental information could be obtained from the USCG for the last 3 ports of call.
- Antifouling coating age and type - (Coutts) As the phase out of TBT-based coatings proceeds, invasion patterns may shift in response to increased use of Copper-based coatings. (Samardzic) Many companies have already moved away from TBT coatings. (Gates) As of 2005, TBT paints could not be sold in the U.S., and all vessels must have sealed (covered) or removed such paints by 2008.

Aquatic Bioinvasion Research and Policy Institute (ABRPI), a partnership between the Smithsonian Environmental Research Center and Portland State University, are currently initiating a study with funding from CSLC, which intends to address many of the above priority research. Current research aims to:

- Estimate “wetted surface area”, or vessel surface area that may be colonized by fouling organisms, that moves into and out of U.S. West Coast ports.
- Investigate pilot methods for biological surveys of fouling organisms across vessel types coming into and out of these same ports.

Future components of the research would include a characterization of fouling communities across vessel types, source ports (transit route), and vessel behaviors (maintenance, residence time, etc). Together, these data sets would then enable an analysis of the overall magnitude of NIS moving through West Coast Ports.

**Information on vessel operations and maintenance factors tied to fouling:** Information on vessel activities that might influence fouling extent and accumulation was considered a high priority, and would be extremely useful if combined with biotic surveys of fouling (described above). Such information could be collected via a vessel survey, with questions related to dry docking, cleaning, painting, and/or laid-up periods, etc.

**Potential survey in conjunction with CA SB 771:** California Senate Bill 771 passed in September (2005) requires the CSLC to conduct a 1 year survey of arriving vessels for greywater/blackwater discharge issues. The CLSC could devise 2-4 targeted fouling related questions in consultation with the scientific community, and add them to this survey. This approach would minimize the number of forms required of arriving vessels, and would collect information that could compliment the biotic surveys.

Information could also be gathered through shipping agents, CSLC inspectors, and coordinated communication with USCG.

**Fouling on military vessels:** Virtually nothing is known about the fouling levels on military vessels, though some likely exhibit high risk behaviors. For example, vessels in the "Mothball" fleet (out-of-service military vessels) have been moored in Suisun Bay (San Francisco Bay Region) for extended periods, and likely contain substantial fouling communities. Transport of such vessels would constitute a high risk event. Unfortunately, research access to military vessels is extremely difficult to obtain. In addition, AB 433 specifically exempts military vessels from its authority, and they are instead subject to the Uniform National Discharge Standards for Vessels of the Armed Forces.

**Cruise/passenger vessels** have been observed to have substantial communities in sea chests, and their voyage patterns may be of particular importance. Such vessels tend to visit pristine areas (marine parks, wilderness areas) that may require higher levels of protection. They make frequent trips on regular routes to international locations (i.e. California to Mexico, California to Canada), increasing NIS exposure from specific regions (repetitious inoculations).

**Stochastic, theoretically high risk vessels**, such as slow moving towed structures, foreign fishing vessels, derelict vessels, should be examined or monitored in California, due to the disproportionately high risk they present in Hawaii and New Zealand. For California, towed drilling platforms may be of particular interest as these may occasionally be moved to other regions in the U.S. and Canada.

**Role of route and freshwater exposure:** There is evidence that freshwater exposure dislodges/inactivates many organisms attached to vessels, suggesting that seagoing vessels that spend some period in freshwater may pose a lower risk in some situations. This effect, and its implications for NIS introduction potential, should be investigated.

**Colonization from vessel to port:** The mechanisms by which organisms may transfer from a visiting vessel to a recipient port, through spawning or in-water cleaning for example (Michin and Gollasch 2003), are important research areas, however, may be of less immediacy given information gaps in more critical areas. In the meantime, it would be good to assume that high levels of fouling on a vessel equate to high risk for introduction to a port.

**Long term monitoring of NIS**, such as the CDFG coordinated monitoring, should clearly be continued. Long term monitoring will be key to evaluate how invasion patterns change with ballast water management, ballast water treatment, and the phase out of TBT. This will also be the primary information needed to attempt to evaluate the effectiveness of management activities.

#### **Potential Management Strategies for California**

The TAG was asked to discuss the following question, "Considering what's known/not known about fouling and other non-ballast water vessel vectors, what management strategies should or could California consider?"

**Further research and vessel operational/maintenance information collection via surveys** (as discussed in the prior section):

- Clear priority
- Some members felt that more information and/or research was needed before regulations or restrictions should be implemented.

**Codes of Practice:**

- At a minimum, these should be developed rather than postponing action until more information is gathered. These could be particularly important if it is decided that it is premature to implement restrictions or regulations.
- Could expand upon the maintenance requirements of merchant classification societies.

### **Requirements for regular sea chest painting and cleaning**

- It was noted that most vessels currently paint sea chests every 5 years.
- Water used to cool a vessel's engine is brought in through sea chest openings. Chlorination systems typically operate to keep cooling system components unobstructed by growth, and sea chests are exposed at some level to the de-fouling action of these systems.
- However, researchers have observed that some sea chests are very clean while others are not. Since many vessels have multiple sea chests, it may be that the operational condition of chlorination/cleaning systems varies in each one, or that the exposure of sea chests to these systems varies.

**Support or incentives for the development of in-water cleaning technologies that eliminate or reduce organism release into the water.** There are a small number of technologies in developmental stages that reduce particle release during in-water cleaning; however, none are known to be ready for commercial distribution:

- U.S. Navy (Jerry Bohlander) – First presented the development of a technology some years back, but current status is unknown.
- 2 companies in NZ claim they have a technology developed that contains organisms as small as 60 microns. System testing will begin in November (2005), and the results may be available in approximately a year.

A major disadvantage of these prototype systems is that they have difficulty reaching the recesses & crevices where fouling is commonly highest. They perform best on exposed laminar surfaces, where fouling is generally the lowest.

Though the ANZECC and some Australian ports promote codes of practice that prohibit in-water cleaning, it's not clear that such prohibitions are beneficial in all situations (i.e. on a heavily fouled vessels). In-water cleaning bans also do not create a win-win situation for environmental protection and commercial shippers. Support or incentives for the development of in-water cleaning technologies have the potential to create a mutually beneficial solution for all parties

**Define parameters for a risk matrix, and implement action on high risk vessels.** Since the vast majority of the arriving fleet will likely present a low risk, it was suggested to focus attention on infrequent, high risk occasions (poorly maintained, slow movers, extended sitters). Some suggestions for action that could be taken were:

- Inspection
- Cleaning requirements/case-by-case permits for cleaning
- Quarantine
- Restrictions on port activities

**Outreach and Education:** An outreach and education component to the merchant shipping industry should be included as part of any recommendations.

## APPENDIX F

### Summary of the California State Lands Commission Technical Advisory Group Meeting

December 19, 2005  
Sacramento, CA

#### ***Proposed Vessel Dismantling Operation in Oregon & Suisun Bay Mothball Fleet***

Ian Davidson provided a brief overview on the developments related to a proposal by Bay Bridge Enterprises to establish a ship dismantling operation in the Port of Newport, Oregon. Should the proposal move forward, the deactivated vessels from Suisun Bay (AKA the "Mothball Fleet") may be moved to Oregon for deconstruction. Originally, relocation was planned for February, but has been postponed due to vocal opposition over the potential for contamination and NIS introductions. It is likely that an EIS will be prepared, and the TAG was asked monitor the federal register notice for the EIS and send comments.

It is unclear which federal or state environmental regulations will have to be followed prior to relocation efforts since most, if not all of the fleet is composed of military vessels. Kim Ward indicated that if California state water quality issues come into play, jurisdiction and oversight would fall to the Regional Water Quality Control Board. Karen McDowell volunteered to find out if anyone from the RWQCB has been monitoring the issue.

Several related newspaper articles from the Oregonian, Portland's main newspaper, were distributed to the group. A December 18<sup>th</sup> article focused specifically on the issue of potential fouling NIS introductions through the relocation activities. Quoted representatives from the Maritime Administration (MarAd), and from the Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (where some vessels have already been moved) were unaware of the hull fouling issue.

#### ***Hull Husbandry Survey for 2006***

As discussed during the last TAG meeting (October 13<sup>th</sup>), 4 questions related to the hull fouling husbandry/fouling control practices were formulated with input from members of the TAG from the scientific community. The questions are designed to supplement biological studies, and were distributed in conjunction with the 2006 California Clean Coast Act survey (see attached document).

The distribution of the survey was targeted at vessels arriving to California, however, it was noted that it would be advantageous if the hull husbandry survey could be distributed more widely. The CSLC welcomes other states to utilize the survey if they are interested. It was noted that vessel identification was missing from form, and the IMO number and vessel name will be added to an amended form. It was also noted the specificity of the question about the type of antifouling treatment applied was unclear (Chapman). If the form is revised, the question and/or the instructions for this question may also be revised.

#### ***Overview of TAG Discussions Thus Far***

Throughout the TAG discussions since May, several considerations have been identified that frame the development of recommendations

- Vessel fouling poses an NIS risk that needs to be addressed
- Specific knowledge on the nature of fouling risk factors for N. America and California is very limited
- There is generalized knowledge on fouling risk factors, based on studies conducted in New Zealand and Hawaii

000662

CALENDAR PAGE

001228

MINUTE PAGE

- Dry docks are in high demand and booked well in advance. There is little flexibility for unplanned scheduling.
- Biocidal antifouling paints pose water quality problems
- Much of the merchant fleet is well maintained, and likely pose lower NIS risk
- Occasional/stochastic vessels likely pose significant NIS risk

During the last TAG meeting (October 13<sup>th</sup>) several potential management frameworks were discussed and prioritized in very broad terms. These were: Information gathering/research, codes of practice, sea chest maintenance requirements, incentives/support for in-water cleaning technology development, and regulatory action on stochastic high risk vessels.

### ***Straw-Person Management Options***

Based on discussions from the October TAG meeting, Staff formulated a set of straw-person management scenarios to generate discussion and constructive criticism during this meeting. TAG members were asked to provide feedback on why options were favorable or not, if or how an option might be improved, and to consider which management ideas might be appropriate both for now and for the future. Scenarios ranged from education and outreach to regulatory action, and were distributed on a handout (see attached document). These were then discussed systematically by the group.

### ***Discussion: Straw-Person Management Options – Outreach***

It was noted that a lack of knowledge on fouling and associated NIS risk was underscored by the Oregon ship dismantling operation controversy. It will therefore be important to increase awareness amongst agencies or companies that may be involved in activities that pose a high fouling risk, and with state and federal entities involved in policy development and decision making (Ruiz).

Discussed entities that may warrant targeted outreach, and avenues for reaching them were:

#### *Commercial Shipping Industry*

- **Target Companies:** salvage operations, dry dock facilities, oil platforms, vessel towing companies
- **Articles for industry publications** such as Pacific Maritime, and maritime listservs
- **Commercial dive companies** that clean and inspect vessels

*UC Sea Grant Extension/West Coast Ballast Outreach Project* has several initiatives planned that may be potential avenues for outreach:

- Seminar series in conjunction with the California Maritime Academy - the fouling issue could be a topic area covered.
- Advisory Committee meeting January 17<sup>th</sup> for input on NIS issues and outreach recommendations
- Regular mailings and/or distribution of pamphlets could include fouling education materials, for example, an insert in the ballast water brochure
- Special workshop organization and coordination.
- Inclusion of fouling information on their website
- Articles in their newsletter

#### *State Resource Agency Networks:*

- **California Association of Professional Scientists** (state scientist union)

- **Western Regional Panel of the ANS Task Force** meetings are organized by Susan Ellis (California Department of Fish and Game) however, this group meets somewhat irregularly and informally

*Federal Agency Priorities and Information Networks*

- **Maritime Administration:** has an environmental officer for the western region. Dragan Samardzic will locate his contact information.
- **ANS Task Force** is composed of a network of federal agencies for the purposes of coordination and communication. Scott Newsham (executive secretary, ANS Task Force) may be a good contact.
- **Additional agencies that should be priority outreach targets:** U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Military, Fish and Wildlife Service, Minerals Management Service
- **Outreach to legislators, such as Sununu and Boxer** through letters or other avenues.
- **Washington DC meetings/briefings** geared towards informing Congressional staffers on relevant current issues and may be good networking/outreach opportunity. These occur throughout the year, and an option could be to sponsor an event through a program such as the Oceans Caucus, or participate/organize events that receive media attention such as the National Invasive Weeds Awareness Week held in DC.

***Discussion: Straw-Person Management Options – Vessel Surveys***

The TAG was asked if a mandatory vessel survey would be beneficial. It was noted that a survey similar to New Zealand's could be very useful, however, without an associated penalty for non-reporting, submission rates will be less effective (Davidson, Miller). It was suggested that fouling questions could also be asked by CSCL inspectors during boarding (Ruiz). If a mandatory survey is implemented, it was suggested that the industry be involved with the formulation of questions to ensure that they are clear and reasonable (Chapman).

***Discussion: Straw-Person Management Options – Hull Maintenance: Codes of Practice & Requirements***

Straw person scenarios outlining specific hull cleaning and coating practices for codes of practice (COP) and maintenance requirements were identical, however, the COP version would be optional whereas requirements would be mandatory. These options are summarized together here, because discussions generally applied to both.

It was noted that promotion/distribution of any COP should be accompanied with information on their rationale and purpose, and with a contact for more information (Ruiz).

Time periods specified in the cleaning requirements (clean within 6 months; coat within 3 years of arrival, 2 week lay-up) generated notable discussion. It was noted that these place holder periods were somewhat arbitrary (Sytsma) and it was unclear if vessels that meet these criteria would constitute a high risk. The TAG was unable to suggest more appropriate time frames. A complicating factor is the variability of fouling rates due to environmental factors. In particular, fouling accumulates faster in warmer waters depending on geographic location. In addition, some antifouling paints are designed to last up to 10 years, and are more effective if not scraped. Frequent cleaning on these coatings may not improve hull cleanliness, and could exacerbate fouling (Gates, Samardzic)

**Idea - Dive inspection rather than cleaning or coating:** A suggestion was put forward to request (in the case of COP's) or require (for regulations) dive inspections, rather than cleaning or coating, if certain criteria are not met by vessels prior to arriving in California (e.g. not cleaned within 6 months, not coated within 3 years, laid-up more than 2 weeks) (Falkner, Chapman). This could be coupled with a requirement to provide the inspection documentation to the CSLC.



If an inspection requirement was implemented, standardized protocols for the survey and collection of specific types of data would need to be developed to ascertain relative fouling risk. Criteria would also need to be developed to discern acceptable versus unacceptable fouling condition (Samardzic). Currently, inspection procedures are performed according to the requirements of classification societies or owners, and focus on mechanical and structural aspects rather than on biological issues (Gates, Samardzic). Inspection reports are unstandardized and narrative in format, typically noting only problems. They are also not conducted in low visibility conditions (~30 ft or less), and are thus not often conducted on the U.S. west coast. (Chapman)

**Inspection videos** are typically taken during diver inspections. If these or photographic images could be collected in a standardized manner, they could provide information for inspection purposes and also biological data for research. Images and video reduce error and are less subjective for data collection and evaluation. Vessel masters also seem to be extremely interested in this type of information, so they may monitor operational aspects of their vessel. (Ruiz)

**Fuel Consumption as an indicator for fouling:** It was asked if fuel consumption is related to fouling accumulation (Berge). There is a relationship between higher levels of fouling and lowered fuel economy, though engine or mechanical problems can also cause increased fuel consumption (Chapman, Samardzic). Chevron has been investigating the relationship, and Brad Chapman will provide information that is available.

#### ***Discussion: Straw-Person Management Options – Regulatory Action on High Risk Arrivals***

**Identification of a high risk vessel** will be critical for determining which will be subject to regulatory action (Berge). The TAG was thus asked to consider what criteria might be used. Some extraordinary cases, such as the Suisun Bay Mothball fleet movement, are very likely high risk situations (Davidson). However, though it is known which general factors constitute higher risk (slow speed, long lay-up, high temperature, etc.), in less extreme cases it is not clear where an acceptable delineation between high and low risk might lie for California. The concept of locating potential high risk vessels for closer investigation is good, but it is not clear if it would be most appropriately implemented as a data gathering activity, or as a regulatory action (Ruiz). At this point in time, it may be best to flush out the characteristics of a high risk vessel, and develop options for what may be done with high risk arrivals, both today and in a few years as new technologies are developed (Ruiz).

**Responsibility and resources:** If inspections or investigations were implemented, it was asked which agency would be responsible for conducting them (Crosson). It will be important to make this determination, and to identify funding that would be needed for such personnel intensive efforts (Falkner).

**Actions on high risk arrivals:** If a vessel was determined to be a high risk arrival, the TAG was asked to consider what actions might be taken.

**A requirement for out-of-water-cleaning** would be difficult to implement due to dry dock demand and scheduling issues, particularly since vessels in this situation would likely be irregular and unplanned (McDowell). An in-water cleaning would not be protective (Chapman).

**Fine or fee:** To be effective, any fine or fee should be higher than the cost of cleaning the vessel, however this would not be protective once a vessel has already arrived in port (Ashe). A fine could also be subjective, unless specific criteria were used to evaluate fouling accumulation (Berge).

**Quarantine:** It was suggested that an area outside of a port, possibly a low current area offshore, could be dedicated towards inspections and in-water cleaning (Samardzic). Identification of such a site would be difficult, however (Ashe), as NIS spread to other areas would still be a potential problem. The state of Hawaii has been investigating potential quarantine sites which would be sacrificial in nature, but have not yet been successful (Kushima).

**Require vessel remedy problem or deny return:** An idea suggested was that if a high risk vessel arrives, require that they remedy the problem before their next visit, and provide documentation that they have done so (e.g. diver cleaning and inspection). If they do not comply, deny entry on the next visit to California (Chapman). A similar type of procedure is used by the Coast Guard. It was noted that though the CSLC's has authority to deny entry, it has never been used and could be challenged (Berge, Falkner).

**Action on extreme risk arrivals:** Though there is not enough knowledge at this point in time to discern between high and low risk vessels for California, it was noted that the state could attempt to define an extreme risk criteria. For example, a vessel laid up for 30-50 years such as those in the Suisun Bay Mothball Fleet would fall into an extreme risk category. Such vessels could be subject to meet certain criteria before entering California waters, or face penalties.

***Discussion: Straw-Person Management Options – In-Water Cleaning Restrictions***

In-water cleaning using a technology or technique where fouling material is contained and collected (not allowed to enter the water column or seafloor) was discussed both as an action that could be implemented on high risk arrivals, and as the only in-water cleaning method allowed in California on any vessel. Though vacuum type-technologies are under development by the Navy, and by companies in New Zealand and Hawaii, none are currently available for commercial application (Kushima, Samardzic). Biological evaluation will occur during 2006 on the New Zealand technology. Other technologies may warrant investigation, such as the limno-curtain used to contain biocides applied to freshwater plant pests.

It was asked what size class fouling organisms typically fall under (Berge). Most research has been focused on larger organisms. There may still be an issue with smaller organisms such as algae spores and microbes, but little research has been done on organisms in these size classes (Ruiz). It was also asked what size filter might be appropriate, say, if a contained in-water cleaning technology utilized one to eliminate organisms prior to discharge in the water column (Falkner). It was suggested that a 50-80 micron mesh might be appropriate, according to unevaluated, best scientific judgment (Ruiz). This would not, however, address microorganisms or algal spores (Ruiz).

***Points of General Agreement:***

- Outreach on vessel fouling as a vector for NIS introductions is a clear priority. Companies engaged in potentially high risk operations, resource agencies, and policy-making entities should be priority outreach targets.
- Biological research on levels and type of fouling on vessels that arrive to California is important.
- Vessel surveys on behavior and maintenance factors that influence fouling will be important to compliment biological research and for the development of risk evaluation.
- The identification of conditions and criteria that constitute a high risk arrival to California/West Coast is needed for the development of regulatory management frameworks.
- For vessels identified as high risk, the development of response measures that prevent NIS release is needed.
- The development of technologies that contain and collect fouling effluent during in-water cleaning is needed.
- If a requirement for diver inspections is implemented, standardized survey methods, data collection protocols, and video/image collection procedures will also need to be developed.

000666

CALENDAR PAGE

001232

MINUTE PAGE

## **X. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

Staff would like to extend special thanks to the following people for contributing a substantial amount of their valuable time and expertise to the development of this report:

Marian Ashe  
John Berge  
Brad Chapman  
Ashley Coutts  
Jeff Crooks  
Holly Crosson  
Ian Davidson  
Nicole Dobroski  
Richard Everett  
Oliver Floerl  
Paul Gates  
Scott Godwin  
Jeffrey Herod  
Jo-Anne Kushima  
Karen McDowell  
Whitman Miller  
Greg Ruiz  
Dragan Samardzic  
Lisa Swanson  
Mark Sytsma  
Drew Talley  
Kim Ward